Asia Pacific Journal of Advanced Business and Social Studies
ISBN (eBook): 978 0 9943656 7 5 | ISSN : 2205-6033
Year: 2020 , Volume: 6, Issue: 1

PROFESSIONAL CAPABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR OPERATIONAL ROLES IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY: THE CASE OF AUSTRALIAN HOSPITALITY GRADUATES

Hazreel Hasmi [a], Janine Williamson [b], Cristina Rodrigues [c]
[abc]Le Cordon Blue Australia, Adelaide, South Australia.
Corresponding Email: hhasmi@cordonbleu.edu

Abstract

Developing students' professional capabilities is crucial in meeting industry standards and requirements (Scott, 2016) and to enhance graduates' employability. Within the Australian hospitality context, there is a current labour shortage (Deloitte Access Economics, 2015), with hospitality employers increasingly demanding highly skilled candidates complete with industry experience (Jackson & Wilton, 2017). To meet industry and student needs, education providers are developing academic units which incorporate industry placements providing opportunities for students to develop their capabilities. Capability development ensures graduates not only possess competencies (skills and knowledge) necessary for them to be work ready, but also the personal, interpersonal and cognitive capabilities necessary for their career development (Scott, 2016). However, studies find that graduates are still lacking the required attributes with capability development considered to be still at a nascent stage (Sissons & Adams, 2013; Weber *et al.*, 2013; Wang & Sai, 2014). Further, even though hospitality managers value operational experience (Walter *et al.*, 2015), the majority of studies focus on entry level management roles (e.g. Sissons & Adams, 2013). Thus, this study investigates the Australian hospitality industry capability requirements for operational roles. An online country-wide quantitative survey was conducted with hospitality employers (n = 125). The study identified that personal and interpersonal capabilities were considered of greater value by employers than cognitive capabilities. To further investigate the number of constructs and structure of each capability, an Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted. These findings are valuable for hospitality curriculum developers, with recommendations for future research related to hospitality student capability development provided.

Keywords: Hospitality, Capabilities, Graduates, Work-Integrated Learning, Career Development.

1. Introduction

Within Australia, a current labour shortage estimated at 38,000 and with forecasts of an additional 123,125 workers required by 2020, including 30,462 management level roles (Deloitte Access Economics 2015). Studies highlight gaps between graduate capabilities and industry expectations (Wang & Tsai, 2014; Raybould & Wilkins 2005; Cheung et al, 2010), further contributing to the labour shortage. Whilst research has been undertaken to identify the capabilities considered essential by hospitality mangers (e.g. Chan, 2011; Sisson and Adams, 2013: Yang, Cheung and Fang, 2015), the results are concentrated on entry level management roles. This ignores the importance of operational experience for these roles (Walter et al., 2015),

and subsequently the requirement to understand the capabilities required to succeed in these roles.

Thus, to close the research gap, the study reported in this paper identifies the capabilities required for entry level roles in the hospitality industry. The findings of the study will contribute to the literature in the hospitality and Work Integrated Learning (WIL) fields and has practical implications for hospitality educators and students.

2. Literature Review

Within hospitality organisations, due to the highly interactive services offered, employees undertake a vital role in creating unique experiences (Kandampully et al, 2018). These unique experiences increase guest satisfaction and loyalty (Bujisic et al, 2014; Kandampully, Zhang & Bilgihan, 2015). To create positive experiences, employees need a combination of competencies and capabilities (Scott, 2016). Whilst "being competent is about delivery of specific tasks in relatively predictable circumstances, capability is more about responsiveness, creativity, contingent thinking and growth in relatively uncertain ones" (Scott, 2016, p. 61). Consequently, employees who possess the required capabilities can adapt to meet guest needs. Studies have identified that hospitality managers value capabilities above technical skills (Hsu et al, 2017), and as a result to achieve their career goals students need to develop them before graduation.

However, for entry level management roles operational experience is still required (Walter et al, 2015), with employers increasingly demanding hospitality graduates possess relevant industry experience (Jackson et al 2016; Li et al, 2015). As a result, hospitality degree programs commonly incorporate Work Integrated Learning (WIL) programs to provide students with opportunities to gain the competencies and capabilities required for graduate roles (Robinson et al, 2015; Smith et al, 2014; Hughes et al, 2014). WIL is a flexible approach to learning (Patrick et al., 2008), complementing on-campus learning (Jackson 2013), and enabling students to make connections between "knowing" and "doing" (Brungardt 2011). Although an increased focus on WIL has been observed in the higher education sector (Jackson, 2013 ref Business skill), gaps in hospitality graduates "work readiness" persist (Wang and Tsai, 2014).

Thus, to increase graduate employability, hospitality higher education providers are required to update and align course curricula to meet industry needs (Alexakis and Jiang, 2019; Hsu et al, 2017). Further, there is a necessity for hospitality curriculum to emphasise capability development (Wesley et al, 2017). To support educators in developing curricula (Wang, Ayers and Huyton, 2009), numerous studies have identified capabilities required for hospitality graduate roles (Chan, 2011; Sisson and Adams, 2013: Yang et al, 2015). However, the findings highlight conflicting judgements between industry stakeholders (Gross, 2017), industry and academics (Huang and Lin, 2010), students and industry (Wang and Tsai, 2014; Harkison et al, 2011) and industry, educators and students (Ruetzler et al, 2014). Further, these studies focus on entry level management roles, overlooking the importance of operational experience required for these roles (Walter et al., 2015), which is commonly gained during WIL programs in entry level roles.

To overcome this current gap in the literature, and provide current information for hospitality curriculum design, this study considered the following question:

"What capabilities are considered essential for hospitality entry level roles?"

3. Methodology

This study has used the Professional Capability Framework (Scott, 2008), which has been validated in a number of studies investigating graduate employability (see Scott et al, 2010; Sheehan et al, 2018), and by teaching and learning leaders (Scott 2016). The Professional Capability Framework is comprised from five interlocking dimensions, three capability

dimensions: personal, interpersonal and cognitive; and two competency dimensions reflecting role specific and generic skills (Scott et al, 2008). In work-based situations, personal capabilities include items connected to s*elf-awareness & regulation, decisiveness* and *commitment*. Interpersonal capabilities relate to an individual's capacity to *influence* or *empathise* with others; whilst cognitive capabilities reflect a graduate's ability to d*iagnose problems; develop strategies;* and remain f*lexible & responsive* (Scott 2016).

For this study, an online quantitative survey was designed. The first section collected socio-demographic data and information related to graduate operational roles. The item measures from the Professional Capability Framework developed by Scott *et al.* (2008; 2009) were used comprising 17 items for the personal capability component; 10 items for interpersonal capability component; and 14 for cognitive capability component.

Industry respondents were asked to rate the skills required for operational role using a Likert type scale, with each point anchored verbally using a 4-point scale; *Essential, Preferred, Desirable and Not required*. The surveys were reviewed by two WIL Lecturers and three Industry Engagement Managers for construct validity check. To test the language and timing, a pilot sample of 10 surveys were completed by Industry Engagement Officers, who have previously worked within the hospitality industry. The surveys took approximately 10 minutes to complete which was considered reasonable.

A convenience sampling approach was utilised with an online survey link emailed to 1589 prospective participants from hospitality business contacts provided by The Industry Engagement Department of Le Cordon Bleu Australia comprising a diverse range of businesses; Accommodations, Restaurants, Tour Operators and Events. Two hundred and thirty-seven emails returned as undeliverable, leaving a sample of 1352. The survey was left active for 2 months from March to April 2018, with 172 responses; 47 of them had incomplete data leaving a sample n=125. According to the e-mail data collection methods (Dillman, 2007), the response rate of 13% was acceptable.

4. Data Analysis and Results

To identify the essential capabilities required for operational roles, mean scores and standard deviation analysis were computed. In all cases of significance testing, an alpha level of <.001 was applied. The socio demographics results showed that the respondents were considered appropriate to serve this study's purpose based on several reasons. Most of the respondents were actively involved in staff recruitment (88.8%), had high levels of involvement in industry placement (84.0%), and about 75% of them have more than 11 years of industry experience. The samples were equally distributed by gender and age, diversity in job roles and levels, sectors and size of organisations in supporting curriculum development in generic hospitality degrees which develop graduates for a broad range of roles and organisations within the hospitality industry.

The following section presents the results for the three capability components required for operational roles. To further investigate the number of constructs and structure of each capability, an Exploratory Factor Analysis was conducted.

Table 1: Graduate Operational Roles

Items	Categories	Quantity	Percentage (%)
Graduates have basic skills for roles in the Hospitality Industry	Agree	81	64.8
Industry Placement benefits graduates	Agree	114	91.2
Minimum requirement for operational roles	Certificate III	53	42.4
	Certificate IV	18	14.4
	Advanced Diploma	8	6.4
	Bachelor's Degree	4	3.2
	Master's degree	1	0.8
	Does not matter	41	32.8

The respondents were also asked to provide comments on the development of work skills within the hospitality graduates. Almost 65% of them agreed that graduates are employable and well-equipped with necessary operational skills. Industry respondents (91%) were also in agreement that industry placement benefits graduates in developing the required skills. According to table 2 almost half of the industry respondents agreed that Certificate level III is the qualification necessary for operational roles in the hospitality industry. However, about 33% of the respondents believed that qualification does not matter to secure a position in the operational roles.

Industry requirements on the personal capabilities for operational roles in the hospitality industry

Every item mean scores were calculated for Industry responses to identify the personal capabilities required for operational roles in the hospitality industry (see Table 2). Industry mean scores ranged from 1.94 to 3.41, with an overall mean score 2.76 with 13 Personal capabilities considered 'Preferred' and 4 'Desirable'. *Ability to maintain professional demeanour and appearance,* and *having determination to produce as good a job as possible* share the same highest mean scores of 3.41. This finding suggests that personal skills are fairly important for operational roles in the hospitality industry.

Table 2: Personal Capabilities Requirement

Code	Personal Capability	Mean	SD
PCOR	Ability to maintain professional demeanour and appearance	3.41	.774
PCOR	Having determination to produce as good a job as possible	3.41	.752
PCOR	Having passion & enthusiasm for their profession and role	3.38	.760
PCOR	Ability to recognise and learn from their mistakes	3.26	.842
PCOR	Having the confidence to work with and seek guidance from senior	3.14	.892
PCOR	Ability to remain calm under pressure	3.09	.852
PCOR	Ability to persevere when things are not working out as anticipated	2.78	.848
PCOR	Willing to help colleagues and undertake tasks outside of their job	2.73	.928
PCOR	Having the capacity to recover quickly from difficulties	2.73	.817
PCOR	Ability to maintain a good work/life balance	2.65	.961
PCOR	awareness of their personal strengths and limitations	2.65	.826
PCOR	Ability to withhold their judgement and not jump in too quickly to	2.61	.841
PCOR	Ability to utilise their personal values and ethics in decision making	2.47	.903
PCOR	Ability to deal with uncertainty	2.36	.856
PCOR	Willing to undertake self-directed projects and be responsible for	2.26	.924
PCOR	Willing to make a hard decision	2.10	.856
PCOR	Having the confidence to take calculated risks	1.94	.892

Industry requirements on the interpersonal capabilities for operational roles in the hospitality industry

The mean scores for interpersonal capabilities required ranged between 2.21 and 3.40 (see Table 3). The overall mean score is 2.79 with all 10 capabilities considered 'Preferred'. This finding highlights the importance of people skills to be developed within hospitality graduates prior to their employment. Honesty in dealing with people, either colleagues or customers, is the main interpersonal skills required from graduates to start their career in hospitality industry.

Table 3: Interpersonal Capabilities Requirement

Code	Interpersonal Capability	Mean	SD
ICOR 9	Ability to be transparent and honest in their dealings with others	3.40	.741
ICOR 1	Ability to develop positive relationships with staff and customers	3.26	.870
ICOR 6	Ability to communicate effectively using verbal, non-verbal and	3.11	.805
ICOR 7	Ability to empathise and work productively with people from a wide	3.02	.818
ICOR	Ability to listen to different points of view before coming to a	2.89	.863
ICOR	Ability to develop and contribute positively to team-based programs	2.79	.816
ICOR 4	Ability to give and receive constructive feedback	2.64	.928
ICOR 5	Ability to develop and use networks of colleagues to solve key	2.28	.799
ICOR 3	Ability to understand how teams and departments operate within a	2.26	.824
ICOR 2	Ability to apply negotiation skills to manage difficult staff or	2.21	.855

Industry requirements on the cognitive capabilities for operational roles in the hospitality industry

The results showed that the mean scores for cognitive capabilities were lower than for personal and interpersonal capabilities. The industry mean scores ranged between 1.97 and 2.72 (see Table 4). The overall mean score is 2.30 with 4 capabilities considered 'Preferred' and 10 'Desirable'. This finding shows that cognitive skills are generally less required from graduates to fill up the operational roles. However, time management mean score shows how important that graduates possess this skill as early as in the operational roles.

Table 4: Cognitive Capabilities Requirement

Code	Cognitive Capability	Mean	SD
CCOR	Having excellent time management skills	2.72	.885
CCOR	Ability to use reflective practice skills to make sense of and learn	2.50	.799
CCOR	Having the understanding that there is never a fixed set of steps for	2.48	.829
CCOR	Ability to see the best way to respond to a difficult situation	2.47	.758
CCOR	Having the confidence to use previous experiences to identify	2.40	.730
CCOR	Ability to adapt a plan of action when problems arise	2.40	.783
CCOR	Ability to make suggestions to resolve work problems	2.35	.710
CCOR	Having the cognitive capacity to think creatively and innovatively	2.31	.745
CCOR	Ability to identify and diagnose the causes of a work-related problem	2.17	.801
CCOR	Ability to critically assess information for the purpose of decision	2.16	.807
CCOR	Ability to recognise how seemingly unconnected activities are in fact	2.14	.700
CCOR	Ability to develop strategies to achieve work objectives	2.11	.775
CCOR	Having the capacity to identify the core issue from a mass of detail in	2.06	.765
CCOR	Ability to assess the likely consequences for a business of applying	1.97	.782

Table 5 summarises the top 20 preferred capabilities required to secure an operational role in the hospitality industry. This list was derived by listing capabilities with mean scores that represent 'Preferred' or near to 'Preferred'. The findings highlight the importance of personal capabilities development (12 out of 20 capabilities) with the top capabilities; *professional demeanour*, *high determination, passion, resilience,* and *working with superior* skills required to succeed in a hospitality operational role. Interpersonal capabilities were ranked as the second most important skills required (7 out of 20 capabilities). *Honesty*, *developing positive relationship* and *communication efficiency* are among the most vital capabilities. *Empathy* and *teamwork skills* also received high scores from the industry.

On the contrary, whilst industry had high scores on both personal and interpersonal skills requirement, only one cognitive capability is listed; time management in rank 16. Based on these results, greater attention by curriculum developers is required in the development of personal and interpersonal skills in preparing the hospitality graduates for the operational roles. Furthermore, the top 20 capabilities highlighted the importance of industry experience during studies, with most of the preferred capabilities students requiring a workplace environment for development.

Table 5: Preferred Capabilities Required for Operational Roles

Code	Capability	Category
PCOR	Ability to maintain professional demeanour and appearance	Personal
PCOR	Having determination to produce as good a job as possible	Personal
ICOR	Ability to be transparent and honest in their dealings with others	Interpersonal
PCOR	Having passion & enthusiasm for their profession and role	Personal
ICOR 1	Ability to develop positive relationships with staff and customers	Interpersonal
PCOR	Ability to recognise and learn from their mistakes	Personal
PCOR	Having the confidence to work with and seek guidance from senior	Personal
ICOR	Ability to communicate effectively using verbal, non-verbal and written	Interpersonal
PCOR	Ability to remain calm under pressure	Personal
ICOR 7	Ability to empathise and work productively with people from a wide	Interpersonal
ICOR	Ability to listen to different points of view before coming to a decision	Interpersonal
ICOR	Ability to develop and contribute positively to team-based programs	Interpersonal
PCOR	Ability to persevere when things are not working out as anticipated	Personal
PCOR	Willing to help colleagues and undertake tasks outside of their job role	Personal
PCOR	Having the capacity to recover quickly from difficulties	Personal
CCOR	Having excellent time management skills	Cognitive
PCOR	Ability to maintain a good work/life balance	Personal
PCOR	Awareness of their personal strengths and limitations	Personal
ICOR	Ability to give and receive constructive feedback	Interpersonal
PCOR	Ability to withhold their judgement and not jump in too quickly to	Personal

After analysing the professional capabilities constructs descriptively, the next step is to perform the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), which reveals the underlying factor structure of the constructs and the interrelationships among the variables. The appropriateness of data for factor analysis was tested using Keiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954; Kaiser, 1970). These tests were to establish the factorability value. Two important issues in determining the suitability of the data set for factor analysis are sample size and the strength of the relationship among variables (Pallant, 2013).

Analysis of the EFA for personal capabilities yielded three factors. The examination of the correlation matrix of personal capabilities scale revealed that all coefficients are above 0.3 except items PCOR 4: *Having the capabilities to recover quickly from difficulties*, PCOR 5: *Ability to maintain a good work/life balance*, PCOR 14: *Ability to persevere when things are not working out as anticipated* and PCOR 15: *Willing to help colleagues and undertake tasks outside their job role when needed*, therefore these items were eliminated.

After eliminating the low loading items, the test was performed again. Table 6 shows the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin value was .784, exceeding the suggested value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970) and Bartlett's Test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954), $\chi 2$ (78) = 447.282, $p<0.001$ also reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

Table 6: KMO and Bartlett's Test of Personal Capabilities

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.784
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	447.282
	Df	78
	Sig.	0.000

The analysis unveiled a total of approximately 56% of the variance (Factor 1 contributing 29%, Factor 2 contributing 18% and Factor 3 contributing 9%). Oblimin Rotation was performed to assist in interpreting these three factors. The rotation solution (see Table 7) shows the three factors with strong loadings (>.3) and all items were loaded in their designated dimensions. Factor 1 signifies self-awareness on developing personal qualities, factor 2 characterises how a person builds confidence, responsibility and ethics in experiencing challenges and uncertainties, and factor 3 represents fairness and beliefs in judgement of a situation. The Cronbach's Alpha value for all factors shows high internal consistency that is above the recommended level of .7 to adjust the scale as reliable (DeVellis, 2003; Nunally & Bernstein, 1994; Pallant, 2013). Therefore, the three factors are accepted.

Table 7: Pattern Matrix of Personal Capabilities

Code	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Communalities	Cronbach's Alpha
PCOR 13	0.833			0.663	0.784
PCOR 12	0.822			0.670	
PCOR 17	0.704			0.473	
PCOR 7	0.684			0.534	
PCOR 1	0.559			0.406	
PCOR 6	0.458			0.413	
PCOR 9		0.846		0.718	0.776
PCOR 8		0.752		0.608	
PCOR 16		0.749		0.544	
PCOR 10		0.699		0.520	
PCOR 11		0.489		0.398	
PCOR 2			0.798	0.649	0.757
PCOR 5			0.771	0.632	

Extraction Method: Principle Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation.[a]

The EFA results for interpersonal capabilities yielded two factors. The correlation matrix test of interpersonal capabilities scale revealed that all coefficients are above 0.3 except item ICOR 4: *Ability to give and receive constructive feedback*, therefore this item was eliminated. After eliminating the low loading item, the test was performed again. Table 8 shows the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin value was .738, exceeding the suggested value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970) and Bartlett's Test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954), $\chi 2$ (36) = 295.988, $p<0.001$ also reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

Table 8: KMO and Bartlett's Test of Interpersonal Capabilities

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.738
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	295.988
	Df	36
	Sig.	0.000

The analysis revealed a total of approximately 53% of the variance (Factor 1 contributing 36% and Factor 2 contributing 17%). Oblimin Rotation was performed to assist in interpreting the two factors. The rotation solution (see Table 9) shows the two factors with strong loadings (>.3)

and all items were loaded in their designated dimensions. Factor 1 characterises general communication skills and factor 2 represents how communication skills can be utilised to overcome and/or prevent organisational issues. The Cronbach's Alpha value for all factors shows high internal consistency that is above the recommended level of .7 to adjust the scale as reliable. Therefore, the two factors are accepted.

Table 9: Pattern Matrix of Interpersonal Capabilities

Code	Factor 1	Factor 2	Communalities	Cronbach's Alpha
ICOR 9	0.767		0.592	0.756
ICOR 7	0.700		0.567	
ICOR 1	0.686		0.472	
ICOR 6	0.615		0.384	
ICOR 10	0.605		0.508	
ICOR 8	0.533		0.480	
ICOR 5		0.810	0.661	0.721
ICOR 2		0.807	0.652	
ICOR 3		0.685	0.508	

Extraction Method: Principle Axis Factoring.

Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation.[a]

Although cognitive capabilities were reported to have less significance in preparing graduates for operational roles in the hospitality industry, it is wise to further investigate the number and structure of the constructs under this capability. The analysis of EFA for cognitive capabilities also yielded two factors. The correlation matrix test of interpersonal capabilities scale revealed that all coefficients are above 0.3 except items CCOR 7: *Having the confidence to use previous experiences to identify solutions to problems which may arise at work*, CCOR 9: *Ability to develop strategies to achieve work objectives*, and CCOR 12: *Ability to adapt a plan of action when problem arise*, therefore these items were eliminated. After eliminating the low loading item, the test was performed again. Table 10 shows the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin value was .827, exceeding the suggested value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970) and Bartlett's Test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954), $\chi 2$ (55) = 514.291, $p<0.001$ also reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

Table 10: KMO and Bartlett's Test of Cognitive Capabilities

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.827
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	514.291
	Df	55
	Sig.	0.000

The analysis revealed a total of approximately 55% of the variance (Factor 1 contributing 43% and Factor 2 contributing 12%). Oblimin Rotation was performed to assist in interpreting the two factors. The rotation solution (see Table 11) shows the two factors with strong loadings (>.3) and all items were loaded in their designated dimensions. Factor 1 represents the general ability to conduct problem solving process and factor 2 characterises how one prepares him/herself emotionally in experiencing problems at work. The Cronbach's Alpha value for all factors shows high internal consistency that is above the recommended level of .7 to adjust the scale as reliable. Therefore, the two factors are accepted.

Table 11: Pattern Matrix of Cognitive Capabilities

Code	Factor 1	Factor 2	Communalities	Cronbach's Alpha
CCOR 4	0.827		0.717	0.856
CCOR 2	0.798		0.628	
CCOR 3	0.768		0.566	
CCOR 6	0.760		0.593	
CCOR 1	0.742		0.538	
CCOR 5	0.510		0.485	
CCOR 11		0.846	0.587	0.730
CCOR 13		0.772	0.618	
CCOR 14		0.554	0.444	
CCOR 10		0.544	0.405	
CCOR 8		0.528	0.442	

Extraction Method: Principle Axis Factoring.

Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation.[a]

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The ability to succeed in operational roles is vital if hospitality students are to achieve an entry level management role when they graduate (Walter et al, 2015). To contribute to the hospitality and Work Integrated Learning (WIL) literature this study aimed to identify the capabilities valued by hospitality managers for operational roles. Supportive of earlier studies (e.g. Robinson et al, 2015; Smith et al, 2014; Hughes et al, 2014), the majority of industry respondents considered WIL assisted students in developing the capabilities required for graduate roles. The importance of industry experience was further exemplified with the majority of capabilities in the top 20 requiring an industry placement for development. Thus, WIL hospitality educators can use the findings of this study to support the development of curriculum which prepares and supports students to develop the required capabilities during an industry placement.

The study identified that industry respondents considered personal and interpersonal capabilities to be of greater value for operational roles. Within the personal capabilities, three factors were identified highlighting the importance for students to increase self-awareness; develop confidence to resolve challenges and manage uncertainties; and assess situations before making decisions. The interpersonal capabilities highlight the importance of developing and using communication skills to overcome and/or prevent organisational issues. Whilst WIL provides students with opportunities to connect knowledge with practice" (Brungardt 2011), educators need to ensure that students are adequately prepared for their industry placement. This includes developing students' awareness and understanding of the capabilities, in addition to acquiring the necessary skills to undertake self-awareness activities. In addition, WIL educators need to ensure industry partners understand the role of industry placement in supporting students to develop the capabilities. This includes ensuring adequate supervision and support is provided.

Whilst industry respondents in this study placed less value on cognitive capabilities, consideration must be given to the purpose of hospitality degrees and motivations of students to participate in them. Hospitality degrees commonly prepare students for management roles, reflected in student career aspirations. Thus, it is essential for WIL educators to include the development of these capabilities within the degree program. The factor analysis identified that students need to develop problem solving skills and their ability to adapt and respond to problems as they arise. However, difficulties may arise for students in developing these capabilities in operational roles. Therefore, it of paramount importance that WIL educators work with industry partners to develop industry placements which provide an opportunity for students to develop these skills. Examples of activities developed in partnership with the industry partner could include the development of assignments which require students to resolve "real work-based problems"; shadowing opportunities with senior managers; or opportunities for students to contribute to management team problem solving activities.

References

i. Bartlett, M. S. 1954. A Note on the Multiplying Factors for Various Chi Square Approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, vol. 16(Series B), pp. 296-298.

ii. Bujisic, M., Wu, L., Mattila, A. and Bilgihan, A. 2014. Not all Smiles are Created Equal: Investigating the Effects of Display Authenticity and Service Relationship on Customer Tipping Behavior. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. *26, no.* 2, pp. 293-306.

iii. DeVellis, R. F. 2003. *Scale development* (2nd. ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

iv. Dillman D. 2007. *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

v. Hughes, K., Mylonas, A. and Benckendorff, P. 2013. Students' Reflections on Industry Placement: Comparing Four Undergraduate Work-Integrated Learning Streams. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, vol. *14, no.* 4, pp.265-279.

vi. Jackson, D. 2013. Business Graduate Employability-Where are We Going Wrong? *Higher Education Research & Development,* vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 776-790.

vii. Jackson, D. and Wilton, N. 2017. Perceived Employability among Undergraduates and the Importance of Career Self-Management, Work Experience and Individual Characteristics, *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 747-762.

viii. Kaiser, H. 1970. A Second Generation Little Jiffy. *Psychometrika, vol 35*, pp. 401-415.

ix. Kandampully, Zhang & Bilgihan, 2015. Customer loyalty: A Review and Future Directions with a Special Focus on the Hospitality Industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. *27, no.* 3, pp. 379-414.

x. Kandampully, J., Zhang, T. and Jaakkola, E. 2018. Customer Experience Management in Hospitality: A Literature Synthesis, New Understanding and Research Agenda. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. *30,* no. 1, pp. 21-56.

xi. Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. 1994. *Psychometric Theory* (3rd. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

xii. Pallant, J. 2013. *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using IBM SPSS* (5th. ed.). Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

xiii. Robinson, R.N., Ruhanen, L. and Breakey, N.M. 2016. Tourism and hospitality Internships: Influences on Student Career Aspirations. *Current Issues in Tourism*, vol. *19, no.* 6, pp.513-527.

xiv. Scott, G. 2016. Transforming Graduate Capabilities and Achievement Standards for a Sustainable Future, *Key Insights from a 2014-2016 Office for Learning and Teaching National Senior Teaching Fellowship*, May 2016.

xv. Sisson, L.G. and Adams, A. R. 2013. Essential Hospitality Management Competencies: The Importance of Soft Skills, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, vol. 25, pp. 131-145.

xvi. Smith, C., Ferns, S. and Russell, L. 2014. The Impact of Work-Integrated Learning on Student Work-Readiness.

xvii. Walters, G., Burns, P. and Stettler, J. 2015. Fostering Collaboration Between Academia and the Tourism Sector. *Tourism Planning & Development*, vol. *12, no.* 4, pp. 489-494

xviii. Wang, Y. F. And Sai, C. T. 2014. Employability of Hospitality Graduates: Student and Industry Perspectives, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 125-135.

xix. Weber, M. R., Crawford, A., Lee, J. and Dennison, D. 2013. An Exploratory Analysis of Soft Skill Competencies Needed for the Hospitality Industry, *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 313-332.